

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/023,995	BRETTSCHEIDER ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
Matthew O Savage	1724	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Matthew O Savage.

(3) ____.

(2) Mr. Robert Mueller.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 4 February 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 5, 10-13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23-25, 33-35, 37, 39, 41, 45, and 46.

Prior art documents discussed:

Art of record.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend independent claims 1, 23, 45, and 46 to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Agreed to amend paragraphs 38 and 41 of the specification to provide antecedent basis for the subject matter added to claims 1, 23, and 46, all limitations being reasonably inferred in paragraphs 38 and 41 of the specification and original drawing Figures 2 and 5. Agreed to cancel claims 4, 11, 12, 24, 33, and 34, the subject matter of which had been incorporated into claims 1 or 23. Agreed to cancel claims 15 and 17 since it was unclear as to what dimensional range "short" implied. Agreed to cancel claims 17 and 39 since the recited limitations had not been illustrated in the drawing Figures. Agreed to various other amendments to claims 5, 13, 16, 21, 35, and 41 to clarify the claims and to ensure proper correspondence between the claims and specification. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details.